THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, JULY 1898.** | **No. 2.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 6.)

Adhikaranas 9, 10.

Having mentioned that form of S'iva—the Para-Brahman possessed of omniscience and other attributes—which is to be worshipped as the source of supreme good, the sûtrakâra introduces the next section with a view to answer a possible objection that the given definition of Brahman is too wide inasmuch as the same names which are applied to Brahman are by usage applicable to other things as well.

Akasa (is Brahman), because of His characteristic marks. (I. i. 23). For the same reason, Prana (is Brahman). (I. i. 24).

The subject of discussion in this section is a passage in the Chhândogya-Upanishad, which reads as follows:

"All these beings, verily, take their rise from âkâs'a, and return into âkâs'a."*

"All these beings, verily, merge into Prâna alone, and from Prâna they arise."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the terms "Prâna" and "âkâs'a"—which denote the cause from which all beings take their arise and in which they attain dissolution—point to Parames'vara, or to bhûtâkâs'a (âkâs'a as one of the rudimental elements) and to prâna (vital air).

The *prima facie* view may be stated as follows: it is prâna (vital air) and bhûta-âkâs'a that are treated of here, since they are spoken of as the cause of all beings in the following passages:

"From prâna alone, verily, are these beings born, by prâna do these born creatures live; into prâna they go and enter." †

"From âkâs'a is the air born" etc. ‡

Against the foregoing view we hold as follows: It is Parames'vara who is referred to by the terms "prâna" and "âkâs'a," because of His characteristic

* Chhâ. Upanishad 1-9-11.
† Tait. Upanishad 3-3.
‡ Tait. Upanishad 2-1.

marks, such as His being the cause of all. Prâna (vital air) and the bhûta-âkâs'a cannot indeed be the cause of all. Now such passages as "From prâna alone, verily, are these beings born," only inculcate the proposition that Brahman, who is bliss in essence, is the cause. They do not teach that prâna etc., are the cause. On the other hand, they form mere anuvâda, *i. e.*, the s'ruti merely repeats what has been thought by another. A'kâs'a being one of the *bhûtas* or rudimental elements, it is included in the term all 'bhûtas'; and the rise of "all bhûtas" can be from Parames'vara alone, as the s'ruti says "From A'tman is âkasa born."* Wherefore it should be concluded that the material âkâsa (bhûtâkâsa) and prâna are not the causes of all beings.

(*Question*): What is the use of the qualification "bhûta" (material) in "bhûtâkâs'a"?

(*Answer*): The epithet has a purpose to serve, inasmuch as there exists another âkâs'a *viz.*, the Paramâkâs'a or transcendental Light, the Parâ-Prakriti or the Great Cause, the cause of all bhûtas.

(*Question*): Then how to conclude that âkâs'a is Parames'vara?

(*Answer*): Because there is no distinction between the two, between Parames'vara and Paramâkâs'a.

Adhikarana. II

In a former section it was shewn that the solar orb is the abode of Parabrahman, the Lord of Umâ, the Lord of the whole universe, free from all taint and from all latent tendencies of evil, the repository of of unsurpassed good. Here, then, the, sûtrakâra refers to another abode of the Lord:

(Brahman is the) Light, because of the mention of the foot. (I. i. 25).

The subject of discussion here is a passage in the Chhândogya-Upanishad which reads as follows:

"Now that Light which shines above this heaven, higher than all, higher than everything, in the highest world, beyond which there are no other worlds, that is the same light which is within man."†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Supreme Light which is said to be in heaven, pervading all worlds, is Parames'vara or some other being?

* Tait. Upanishad 2-1.

† Chha. Upanishad 3-13.

(*Pûrvapaksha*): The word 'dyu' stands for heaven, and the light which is said to be "above this heaven" may therefore here mean the sun himself. Or, as the words 'the light within man' point to the light being within man, it may be that the digestive fire in the stomach is here referred to.

(*Siddhânta*): The words "the light which shines above this heaven" refer to Parames'vara Himself who is the Supreme Light, higher than all; for, in a former passage, "All creatures form a foot of His";* all creatures are said to be a part of this light. This cannot apply to the sun and digestive fire in the stomach, whose range of action is limited.

(*Objection*): In a former passage, Gâyatrî is described to be all-pervading in the words "Gâyatrî, verily, is all this existence."† As occurring in the same context, the passage "All creatures form a foot of His" teaches only that the universe is a part of Gâyatrî.

This objection is thus answered:

(If you say it is) not so because of the mention of the metre, (we say) no, because (it is) the meditating (of Brahman) in that way (that is) taught; so, indeed, there is an instance. (I. i. 26).

(*Objection*): Because of the mention of the metre in a former passage, "Gâyatrî, indeed, is all this existence," the same thing is spoken of here, not the Parames'vara.

(*Answer*): It cannot be that Gâyatrî, a mere metre, is all-prevading. On the other hand, we are taught to contemplate Parames'vara who resembles Gâyatrî: just as Gâyatrî is made up of four feet containing six syllables each and is four-footed, so Brahman too is four-footed. Accordingly, elsewhere, a word denoting metre is found applied to a different thing in virtue of some point of resemblance; as for instance, in the Samvarga-Vidyâ where the s'ruti beginning with the passage, "These five and the other five make ten, and that is the *krita*" ‡ says "these are again the Virâj." Wherefere in the determining of the subject propounded in the passage in question, the characteristic mark of Parames'vara, *viz.* all-pervadingness, should prevail as against the argument derived from the fact of the passage occurring in the section treating of Gâyatrî.

* Chha. Upanishad. 3-12.

† Chha. Up. 3-12.

‡ Chha. Up. 4-3.

And because of its congruity with the description of creatures etc. as feet, (it should be) so. (I. i. 27).

The statement that it is four-footed by creatures, earth, body and the heart, cannot apply to the metre called Gâyatrî. It applies only to Parames'vara.

The sûtrakâra again raises and refutes an objection:

If (you hold it is) not (so) because of a diversity in the teaching, (we answer) no, because there is no inconsistency in either case. (I. i. 28).

(*Objection*): It is not right to hold that, because there is a reference made to a connection with heaven in the passage "All creatures form one foot of His; His immortal three feet being in heaven,"* Parames'vara is described in the passage which speaks of 'light'; for, the two being quite distinct from each other as shewn by a diversity in their teaching, there can be no reference to the one by the other. In the passages "His immortal three feet are *in* the heaven," and "The Light which shines *above* the heaven," † the word denoting 'heaven' occurs in two different cases, (*i. e.* in the locative and the ablative cases), and therefore there is a diversity in the teaching. Hence the mutual opposition of the passages in question.

(*Answer*): No, for there is no diversity between the two passages, just as there is no difference between the following two statements: "There is a hawk *on* the top of the tree;" and "There is a hawk *above* the top of the tree." Wherefore in either case it is intended to declare that the light is above the heaven. By this characteristic mark, it may also be concluded that it is Parames'vara who is the Purusha spoken of in the Purusha-Sûkta, inasmuch as there, too, it is taught that "A foot of His are all the creatures."‡ Hence the conclusion that the Supreme Light which shines in heaven and of which the whole universe forms only a part is none other than Parames'vara.

Adhikarana 12.

In the last adhikarana it has been shewn that the Parames'vara, referred to as the main object of worship in the orb of the Blessed Sun, Himself constitutes the whole universe. The present section proceeds to show that other beings form object of worship as ensouled by Him, and not otherwise.

* Chha. Up. 3-12, 13.
† Chha. Upanishad 3-12, 13.
‡ Tait. Aranyaka 3-12.

So is prana, because of the occurrence (of His attributes). (I. i. 29)

The passage which has to be discussed here is the Indra's speech occurring in the Kaushîtaka-Upanishad;

"I am Prâna; do thou meditate on me as the conscious A'tman, as life, as immortality."*

The doubt arises here as to whether the being referred to as an object of worship and put in apposition with the word 'prâna' is Indra or Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:) Here in the passage "I am prâna, the conscious A'tman, and me etc." we see that the word 'prâna' is evidently put in apposition with 'Indra.' The passage, "worship me," clearly states that the injunction of worship refers to none but Indra. It is but proper to speak of him as prâna because he supports all beings by means of rain. As possessed of supreme power, he may also be spoken of as the object to be worshipped by all. Accordingly the s'ruti says "Indra is the king who rules the world"† and so on. Wherefore Indra himself is here spoken of as the object of worship.

The *Siddhânta* maintains that it is the Parames'vara—Why?—Because His peculiar attributes—such as, He is the Bliss, He is without decay, immortal, He is the conscious Self—are found described when speaking of the being referred to by the word prâna:

"He is none other than prâna, conscious A'tman, the Bliss, without decay, immortal." †

In the passage "Indra is the king" we should by the context understand the word "Indra" to mean I's'vara.

Again an objection is raised and refuted:

(If you say it is) not (He), because of the speaker's reference to himself, (we reply that) there is indeed in this (section) a preponderance of attributes of A'tman. (I. i. 30.)

(*Objection*): The being here referred to as the object of worship is not Parames'vara; for, in the opening sentence such as "know me alone............... the three-headed son of Tvashtri did I slay." ‡ Indra who is well-known to be a jîva is spoken of as the object of worship. And the concluding passage of the section should be interpreted in accordance with the opening passage.

(*Answer*): It is not right to say so: in this section, from the very commencement, Parames'vara's charac-

* Kaushîtaka-Upanishad 8.
† Tait. Aranyaka 3-11.
‡ Kaushîtaka Upanishad 3.

teristic attributes are found in great preponderance. Thus, the opening passage proposes to treat of the most beneficial worship in the words "That which thou thinkest the best for man."* This, indeed, is a characteristic property of Parames'vara, His worship alone being the most beneficial as a means of attaining moksha. In the middle of the section, too, He is spoken of as the impelling agent of others in all their actions, in the following passage :

> "For he makes him, whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, do a good deed ; and the same makes him, whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds, do a bad act."*

So also he is spoken of in the following passage as the basis of the whole universe made up of both the sentient and insentient existence :

"As in a car the circumference of a wheel is placed on the spokes, and the spokes on the nave, thus are these external objects placed on the subjective states of consciousness and these states of consciousness are placed on the prâna."†

And this, too, being a characteristic property of Parames'vara Indra cannot be the being here spoken of as the object of worship.

(*Objection*) :—If, as a Jîva, Indra is not the object of worship, then how is it that he inculcates the worship of himself ?

The sûtrakâra thus answers :

(It is) from the standpoint of the scriptures that he inculcates it, like Vamadeva. (I. i. 31).

From the standpoint of such passages of the scripture as "In the form of this Jîva entering, I shall differentiate name and form,"‡ Indra saw that Parames'vara was the being denoted by all words and that therefore Indra himself was His body ; and he accordingly refers to Parames'vara by his own name 'Indra' and inculcates Him alone as the object of worship. Hence the reference to Parames'vara by the word 'Indra.'

The sûtrakâra quotes an example, "like Vâmadeva." Vâmadeva saw that Parames'vara was none but his own A'tman and exclaimed "I have become Manu and Sûrya." Just so is Indra's declaration.§

* Kaushîtaka Upanishad 3.
† Kaushitaka Upanishad 3.
‡ Chha. Upanishad 6-3.
§ Brihada.Upanishad 3—4.

Or thus : When, by the contemplation of the harmonious nature of Brahman and A'tman brought about by Vedântic knowledge, Vâmadeva attained to the state of Brahman and was freed from all the imaginary limitations due to the identifying of himself with the human body and so on, and his mighty ego expanded so as to embrace the whole universe, he saw that he was present everywhere and accordingly spoke of himself as one with the whole universe including Manu and Sûrya. So, it may be concluded, it was in the case of Indra. In the passage "I am prâna, the conscious Atman,"* Prâna refers to Para-Brahman, inasmuch as He, blissful by nature, is the cause of all life, as said in the s'ruti "Prâna is the conscious self, the Bliss, undecaying and immortal." Accordingly it is from the standpoint of Brahman that Indra taught "I am Brahman," "me do thou worship" So, too, Krishna taught to Arjuna, and so several others.

Again an objection is raised and refuted :

(If you say it is) not (so) because of the characteristic marks of Jiva and prana proper, (we reply) no, because, His worship being threefold and He being their basis, it is explicable. (I. I. 32.)

(*Objection*) : It is but proper that Indra should speak of himself as the object of worship and as an all-pervading being, when, having attained by the contemplation of Brahmajnâna to the condition of Brahman, he was freed from the condition of jîva and spoke from the standpoint of Brahman. Here in the passages "I killed the three-headed son of Tvashtri"† and "till prâna dwells in the body, till then there is life,"† the characteristic marks of jîva and prâna proper are evident. So this teaching is not explicable.

(*Answer*) : You should not say so. It is but proper that Parames'vara is spoken of as a jîva and prâna ; for there is a threefold worship. Here it is intended to teach a threefold worship of Parames'vara,—in His own form, in the form of Bhoktâ or jîva, in the form of Bhogya or the object of sense. This may be explained by the fact that He is the basis of Bhoktâ and Bhogya, the jîvas and objects of sense. The worship of Parames'vara in His own form leads to immediate salvation, whereas the other two do so in course of time. Wherefore we conclude that as a form of Parames'vara who dwells in him as his A'tman, Indra forms an object of worship.

Thus ends the commentary of Srîkantha-S'ivâchârya on Pâda i. e., of the Adhyâya I., of the Brahma-Mimâmsâ.

* Kaushîtaka.—Upanishad 6.
† Kaushitaka-Upanishad 3.

SECOND PA'DA.

Adhikarana. I.

Owing to the endlessness of vedântic passages treating of Brahman, it is not possible to discuss every one of those passages. By a discussion, therefore, of some only of those passages, the meaning of others have to be determined on the same principles of interpretation. Thus, a few only of the passages are dealt with in the Sûtras by way of determining that those passages treat of Brahman as shewn by a concurrence of the marks which serve to determine the main drift of the passages.

In the first pâda have been discussed a few of such passages as contain clear hints shewing what the main drift of the passage is. In the second pâda will be discussed a few of such passages as contain hints which are not quite so explicit.

(The passage refers to Parames'vara) as teaching of Him who is present everywhere. (I. ii. 1).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad and reads thus:

> "The manomaya, whose body is prâna, whose form is thought, whose will is unfailing, whose nature is like A'kâs'a, from whom all desires proceed...... ....He is myself within the heart."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as *manomaya* and so on is Parames'vara or Jîva.

(*Pûrvapaksha*): It is Jîva.—Why so?—Because he is more proximate. In the passage which just precedes the one under discussion, *viz*.,

> "Now man is a creature of will. According to what his will is in this world, so will he be when he has departed this life. Let him therefore have this will and belief;" †

Jîva is spoken of as wandering in this and in the next world under the influence of karma. Then comes the passage commencing with "*manomaya*." Wherefore we conclude that it is Jîva who is referred to as "manomaya." These attributes—that he partakes of the nature of manas and that he has prâna for his body—belong to a samsârin: they are not attributes of Parames'vara. When this interpretation is accepted, the epithet "satyasankalpa" may be applied to a samsârin or jîva by interpreting it to mean "*sati asankalpa*, he whose thought is not directed to the Real (Sat)." Wherefore it is Jîva that is spoken of as 'manomaya' and so on, not Parames'vara.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows:—It is Parames'vara that is spoken of as 'manomaya' and so on. Why?—Because it is the Para-brahman, the Parames'vara, that is spoken of as the cause of all and as the object of worship in the opening passage:

> "All this is Brahman, as beginning, ending, and breathing in Him; and therefore let a man meditate on Him."

This passage may be explained as follows: The origin, existence and end of all this depends on Brahman. All this, both the sentient and the insentient existence, is verily Brahman, and therefore let a man meditate on Brahman, tranquil in mind. Just as water-bubbles which have their origin, existence and end in the ocean, are found to be only forms of that ocean, so, too, that which depends for its origin etc. on Brahman associated with s'akti must be made up of Brahman and nothing else. Nothing distinct from Him is ever perceived. Accordingly in the Atharva-s'iras it has been declared by I'sâna as follows:

> "Alone I was at first, (alone) I am and shall be; there is none else distinct from Me."‡

And then was declared by Him in the words "I am Brahman,"§ that the whole universe is His own form. And in the words "He entered the more hidden from (or *than*) the hidden one" etc., * His entering into the universe is given as a reason for the whole universe being His own form. Thus, this universe having no origin, existence or end outside Brahman, it is not a quite distinct thing from Brahman. Accordingly the learned say:—

> "His s'aktis or energies (form) the whole world, and the Mahes'a or the Great Lord is the energetic (S'aktimân). Never can energy exist distinct from the energetic. Unity of these two is eternal, like that of fire and heat, inasmuch as unseparateness always exists between energy and the energetic. Wherefore the supreme energy belongs to the supreme A'tman, since the two are related to each other as substance and attribute. The energy of heat is not conceived to be distinct from fire" and so on.

Vâyu-Samhitâ, too, says:

* Chha. Up. 3-14.

† Chha. Up. 3-14.

"From S'akti up to earth, (the whole world) is born of the principle S'iva. By Him alone, it is pervaded, as the jar etc. by clay. His variegated supreme S'akti, whose form is knowledge and bliss, appears as one and many, like the light of the sun."

The following passages of the s'ruti speak of Para-brahman as possessed of infinite powers of creating, ruling and maintaining the world, all inherent in Him:

"His supreme S'akti is spoken of as manifold, inherent, endued with the activity of knowledge and life."*

"One verily is Rudra,—they were not for a second —who rules these worlds with the powers of ruling."†

In short, on the authority of S'ruti, Smriti, Itihâsa, Purâna, and the sayings of the learned, the Supreme S'akti—whose manifold manifestation this whole universe of chit and achit is, whose being is composed of Supreme Existence, Intelligence and Bliss, and is unlimited by space and time—is inherent in the nature of S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, and constitutes His own essential form and quality. Apart from S'akti He cannot be the Omniscient, the Omnipotent, the cause of all, the all-controlling, the all-adorable, the all-gracious, the means of attaining all aspirations, and the omnipresent; and, moreover, such grand designations as '*Mahes'vara*' the Supreme Lord, '*Mahâdeva*' the supreme deity, and '*Rudra*' the expeller of pain, cannot apply to Him. Thus it is Brahman whose body is the whole sentient and insentient universe, and who is denoted by all words. Just as the word 'blue' denotes not the blue colour only, but also the lotus which is of blue colour, so does the word 'universe' also denotes Brahman. Therefore, such passages as "All is Rudra verily" teach that Brahman is denoted by all words. Accordingly the passage "All this, verily, is Brahman" refers to Brahman whose body the whole of the sentient and unsentient universe is. The universe being thus a form of Brahman and being therefore not an object of hatred etc., let everyone be peaceful at heart and worship Brahman. This doctrine is clearly expounded even in the purânic texts such as the following:—

"The body of the God of Gods is this universe, moving and immoving. This, the Jîvas (Pas'us) do not know, owing to the mighty bondage. They say sentiency is Vidyâ, and insentiency Avidyâ. The whole universe of Vidyâ and Avidyâ, is no doubt the body of the Lord, the Father of all; for the whole universe is subject to Him. The word 'sat' is used by the wise to denote the real and the good, and 'asat' is used by vedic teachers to denote the contrary. The whole universe of the *sat* and the *asat* is the body of Him who is on high. Just as, by the watering of the roots of a tree, its branches are nourished, so by the worship of S'iva, the universe which is His body is nourished. A'tman is the eighth body of S'iva the Paramesvara, pervading all other bodies. Wherefore the whole universe is ensouled by S'iva. If any embodied being whatsoever be subjected to constraint, it will be quite repugnant to the eight-bodied lord; as to this there is no doubt. Doing good to all, kindness to all, affording shelter to all,—this, they hold, is the worshipping of S'iva." And so on.

Brahman being all-formed, it is but right to say "all is Brahman" and "let every one be peaceful and worship Brahman." Wherefore it is Brahman who in the opening passage is stated to be the object of worship, that is also spoken of as manomaya, as partaking of the nature of manas, and so on. Neither should it be supposed that the partaking of the nature of manas is a characteristic mark of a samsârin; for Brahman may limit Himself by assuming a shape which can form an object of worship.

As to the contention that because Jîva, is a creature of his own will it is Jîva who is spoken of as 'manomaya,'—we say that such a contention is untenable; for, since the upâsanâ has to be construed as having for its object Brahman who is mentioned as such in the sentence where the upâsanâ is enjoined, it is not possible for that upâsanâ to have again for its object Jîva who is but incidentally mentioned; as in the case of *âmikshâ*,* which has been proved to appertain to Vis'vedevas who have already been mentioned in connection with it, not the *vâjina* which belongs to vâjins. Wherefore it is Brahman who is to be worshipped as possessed of attributes mentioned in the passage commencing with 'manomaya'

A. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued*).

* Sveta. Upanishad 6-8.

† Sveta. Upanishad 3-2.

* See Jaimini. Mimamsa. 2-2-23.

TIRUMANTRA BY TIRUMULAR.

Continued from page 173, Vol. I.

தொடர்ந்துநின் றானைத் தொழுமின் றொழுதாற்
படர்ந்துநின் றான்பரி பாரக முற்றுங்
கடந்துநின் றான்கம லம்மலர் மேலே
யுடந்திருந் தானடிப் புண்ணிய மாமே. (௨௬)

26. Worship Him who is ever with you. Then the Omnipresent Lord will remember you. Beyond all thought, He yet dwells in our Lotus Heart. This fortune is from His Grace.

சந்தி யெனத்தக்க தாமரை வாண்முகத்
தந்தமி லீசன ருணமக் கேயென்று
நந்தியை நாளும் வணங்கப் படுமவர்
புந்தியி னுள்ளே புகுந்துநின் றானே. (௨௭)

27. The *Nandi* dwells in the hearts of those who considering that the grace of the Eternal Lord whose brilliant Lotus Face resembles the evening sky, will ever be with them, worship Him every day.

இணங்கிநின் றானெங்கு மாகிநின் றானும்
பிணங்கிநின் றான்பின்முன் னாகிநின் றானு
முணங்கிநின் றானம ராபதி நாதன்
வணங்கிநின் றார்க்கே வழித்துணை யாமே. (௨௮)

28. The God of Gods, He is ever inseparably in you. He is in all. He is near you. He is before all, and He is after all. He is concealed in all. He is the guide to those who worship Him.

காணநில் லாயடி யேற்குற வாருள்ள
நாணநில் லேனுன்னை நான்றழு விக்கொள்ளக்
கோணநில் லாத குணத்தடி யார்மனத்
தாணிய னாகி யமர்ந்துநின் றானே. (௨௯)

29. O Thou Lord who art forced in the heart of the sinless Devotees, as is the iron nail in a green tree, Let me behold Thee! Who but thee is my kith and kin? I will not be ashamed to embrace Thee.

வானின் றழைக்கு மழைபோ லிறைவனுந்
தானின் றழைக்குங்கொல் லென்று தயங்குவா
ரானின் றழைக்கு மதுபோலென் னந்தியை
நானின் றழைப்பது ஞாலங் கரியே (௩0)

30. People despond if God will call out to them as with the voice of thunder from the sky. The world is witness to my calling out to Him as the cow after its first calf.

மண்ணகத் தானொக்கும் வானகத் தானொக்கும்
விண்ணகத் தானொக்கும் வேதத்தி னொக்கும்
பண்ணகத் தின்னிசைப் பாடலுற் றானுக்கே
கண்ணகத் தேநின்று காதலித் தேனே. (௩௧)

31. He dwells in Bhuloka (earth) Bhuvar loka (middle regions) and *Suvarloka* (highest regions) He dwells in the Pranava. He sings the song of triumph with the lute (when everything is resolved). Him I love in my heart.

தேவர்பி ரானம்பி ரான்றிசை பத்தையு
மேவுபி ரான்விரி நீருல கேழையுந்
தாவுபி ரான்றன்மை தானறி வாரில்லை
பாவுபி ரானருட் பாடலு மாமே. (௩௨)

32. The God of Gods is our Lord. He spreads on all the ten sides. He transcends the vast seven regions. None know His real nature. If we sing His paises, we will deserve His Grace.

பதிபல வாவது பண்டிவ் வுலகம்
விதிபல செய்தொன்று மெய்ம்மை யுணரார்
துதிபல தோத்திரஞ் சொல்லவ லாரு
மதியிலர் நெஞ்சினுள் வாடுகின் றாரே. (௩௩)

33. Many Gods have they in this world. Many Vedic rites they perform, yet they know not the Truth. They are proficient in singing the various Vedic Hymns, yet they suffer pain in the hear, without knowing the Truth.

சாந்து கமழுங் கவரியின் கந்தம்போல்
வேந்த னமரர்க் கருளிய மெய்ந்நெறி
யார்ந்த சுடரன்ன வாயிர நாமமும்
போந்து மிருந்தும் புகழவென் றானே. (௩௪)

34. The King of Kings who is united in all like the smell of Kasturi (musk) in sandal paste commanded the Gods to follow the true path by repeating the glorious thousand names of His, while sitting or walking (at all times).

ஆற்றுகி லாவழி யாரு மிறைவனைப்
போற்றுமின் போற்றிப் புகழ்மின் புகழ்ந்திடில்
போற்றிசைக் குங்கிழக் குத்திசை யெட்டுக்கு
மாற்றுவ னப்படி மாடமு மாமே. (௩௫)

35. If you want to pursue the easiest path (of knowing Him), worship Him and sing His Glory. Then your own glory will grow over you lifting its head over the West and the East and on all sides.

அப்பனை நந்தியை யாரா வமுதினை
யொப்பிலி வள்ளலை யூழி முதல்வனை
யெப்பரி சாயினு மேத்துமி னேத்தினா
லப்பரி சீச னருள்பெற லாமே. (௩௯)

36. He is Our Father, Nandi, the never failing Ambrosia, the incomparable Benefactor, the eternal Lord; Him adore ye in any manner; and in the same manner will you reap His Grace.

நானுநின் றேத்துவ னாடொறு நந்தியைத்
தானுநின் றன்றழற் போலொக்கு மேனியன்
வானுணின் றார்மதி போலுட லுள்ளுவந்
தூனினின் றங்கே யுயிர்க்கின்ற வாறே. (௩௭)

37. I will adore the Beloved Lord every day. He showed Himself to me with the Body resembling fire. He manifests Himself in our heart as the Full Moon in its splendour in the Heavens.

பிதற்றொழி யேன்பெரி யானரி யானைப்
பிதற்றொழி யேன்பிற வாவுரு வானைப்
பிதற்றொழி யேனெங்கள் பேர்நந்தி தன்னைப்
பிதற்றொழி யேன்பெரு மைத்தவன் றானே. (௪௮)

38. Him, the great and subtle I will not fail to blabber about; Him with the Form uncreate, I will not cease to speak about; Him with the beloved name Nandi I will not cease to think about. Him, the great Yogi I will not fail to adore.

வாழ்த்த வல்லார் மனத் துள்ளுறு சோதியைத்
தீத்தனை யங்கே திளைக்கின்ற தேவனை
யேத்தியு மெம்பெரு மானென் றிறைஞ்சியு
மாத்தஞ் செய் தீச னருட் பெறலாமே. (௩௯(

39. The Light that shines in the heart of His worshippers, the immaculate God who is enjoyed therein, Him, if we worship as our Lord and love him we will deserve His Grace.

குறைந்தடைந் தீசன் குரைகழ னாடு
நிறைந்தடை செம்பொனி னேரொளி யொக்கு
மறஞ்சிடஞ் செய்யாது வாழ்த்த வல்லார்க்குப்
புறஞ்சடஞ் செய்யான் புகுந்துநின் றானே.(௪0)

40. In true humility, approach His Feet. Then He will fill your heart with the splendour of molten gold. Those who adore Him without forgetfulness, He will not deceive. He will dwell in them.

சினஞ்செய்த நஞ்சுண்டதேவர்பிரானைப்
புனஞ்செய்த நெஞ்சிடைப்போற்றவல்லார்க்குக்
கனஞ்செய்த வாணுதற்பாகனுமாங்கே
யினஞ்செய்த மான்போலிணங்கிநின்றானே. (௪௧)

41. The God of Gods who drank the fearful poison if, in their cultivated hearts, they will cherish, the Partner of Her, the adorable and beautiful Uma, will join them (fast), as the separated deer its herd.

போயரன் றன்னைப் புகழ்வார்பெறுவது
நாயகனன்முடி செய்ததுவேநல்கும்
மாயகஞ்சூழ்ந்துவர வல்லராகிலும்
வேயனதோளிக்கு வேந்தொன்றுந்தானே. (௪௨)

42. Those who praise the Lord Hara will deserve His Highest Crown Others, though they, the world circumambulate, will they ever deserve the union with Uma's Lord.

போற்றியென்பா ரமரர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்பா ரசுரர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்பா மனிதர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்னன்புள் விளங்வைத்தேனே. (௪௩)

43. The Devas cry, 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' The Asuras cry 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' The Men cry 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' These Feet I also Glorify and make manifest in my love.

விதிவழியல்ல திவ்வேலையுலகம்
விதிவழியின்பம் விருத்தமுமில்லை
துதிவழிநின்றலும் சோதிப்பிரானும்
பதிவழிகாட்டும் பகலவனாமே. (௪௪)

44. By following the Vedic law, this seagirt world. derives its pleasures and pains. To those following the *Bhakti Marga*, The Effulgent Lord will become the Sun to light the *Pathi-Marga*.

(*To be continued*)

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR OF ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 9.*)

MAYAVADI'S STATEMENT.

1. We will state the system promulgated by the Mâyâvâdi himself, who incorrectly believing that he is himself God and all the world is a whirl-car, and yet dwelling in the body, professes to initiate other Jivas in his path.

2. This *Brahman* is the cause of all the worlds, the limitless bliss and intelligence, is formless, omnipresent and eternal, is true and pure, free from all marks and attributes, and is the measure of the Vedas, and is without distinction of Gnathuru and Gnana.

3. As the one Sun shining in numerous pots of water leaves its reflection in each and yet passes beyond, so this one God lives in each body and yet is imperceptible to the senses and *andakaranas*. Accordingly God cannot be known by the 6 kinds of proof such as observation &c.

4. The rope appears as snake in darkness. When light dawns, the rope appears as rope and the snake disappears as a delusion. Similarly, the world appears as Sat when deluded ; in spotless wisdom, the true Chit appears as Sat ; and all the world's allurements will appear mad.

5. The world appears derived from the *Nirvachana* Brahman. If not, it cannot come into being at all. If it is an independent material cause, it must exist for ever. (The reason why it changes is) because it is a delusion. When both the shell and the silver piece are thrown into the furnace the silver comes out bright but the shell is destroyed. So, in *paramarthika*, the changeless God appears as true and the world disappears as false.

6. The material cause of the world is the Sat. As the spider produces from itself the thread and works it into a web and then takes it back into itself, so God, originates the world as real, and sustains it and when he resolves it, it becomes unreal again. Looking to its place of origin, the world and all its appearances are also Sat.

7. The course of evolution is this. From Brahm was produced Akas, from Akas air; from air fire; from fire, water; from water, earth; and from these elements, plants, and from plants food, and from food the body and its six component parts.

8. The above mentioned six parts constitute *annamayakosha* ; when the air vitalizes these, they constitute the *pranamayakosha* ; with the *manas*, they form the *manomayakosha* ; with *buddhi* and *gnanendriyas*, they constitute the *vignanomayakasha* ; with the above and *karmendriyas*, they constitute the *anandamayakosha*.

9. This Brahman appears united in this visible body composed of the above mentioned *Panchakoshas*. The way in which he so appears is similar to the rays of the Effulgent Sun which is difficult to be reached in the sky becoming reflected in several pots of water. Yet God does not become, tainted by such contact, as Pasa cannot bind God.

10. As the same thread strung through countless beads of different colours appears also as particolour-

---

1. Some uncomplimentary epithets are applied to the Mayavadi, as he mistakes the Jiva subject to karma, birth and death and suffering, who has no independence (*Aswatantra*) and is of imperfect intelligence with the Being, who is eternally free and intelligent, and omniscient, self-dependent (*Swadavne*) and self-luminous (Swamprakasa) and all powerful; and the inconsistency of his position is brought out that while he professes to be himself God he could not avoid dwelling in this body of sin and sorrow and while he professes to reject the whole world as delusive, he believes in the authority of the Vedas and the rules prescribed therein.

3. The 6 kinds of logical proof admitted by the Mayavadi are observation, inference, *Agama*, *Upamana*, *Aruthapatti* and *Abava*.

The being above the andakaranas is God, Jiva being also above the andakaranas Jiva and God are identical. Professors of this school however quibble and differ a good deal about the precise meaning of the Jiva or Atma or Purusha or soul. One learned Swami defined it as a combination of Brahman's shadow, a bit of andakarana and a bit of Avidya ! Another talented lady when we asked for a definition, and we expected more light from her, gave an answer of the type of the old schoolmaster's definition, 'refer to the dictionary' and we were told to refer to the Gita and Brihadaranyaka. We will discuss these definitions and others later on.

Will any Sanscrit Pundit tell us in which of the 108 Upanishads this illustration occurs ? Whether it occurs in any of the 12 Principal Upanishads ?

7. The 6 parts are skin, bone, blood, nerves, flesh, and semen.

8. Kosha means an organ or part.

9. If so, we have asked, to whom is Bhanda, birth and death, sin and sorrow, to whom is moksha ? Do all these happen to the Atma or to the body ? If to the body, and the soul does not suffer, why care we to attain freedom from death and birth ? What reck we if the body suffers all this ? Are we really seeking moksha for the flesh and not for the soul ? Are all these things delusions merely ? If so will not the attempt to free one from delusion be itself a delusion ? And then why should it not remain in eternal delusion ? Are there any defects attached to remaining in this state of delusion and what are they ? These questions and more have been asked again and again, and except the honest reply that they are not answerable, no reply has ever been forthcoming. And yet the tide rolls on for ever and how many get plunged under its blinding waves !

10. To whom does he appear as different and as undergoing different experiences ? To himself or to others ? If to others, who are they ?

ed, so the one God dwelling in different bodies appears as different beings and appears as undergoing different kinds of enjoyments without in fact undergoing such.

11. The one Brahman is known by different names by its union in different bodies and appears to undergo enjoyments of pleasure and pain. It undergoes in the body the four avasthas, *Jagra, Swapna, Sushupti* and *Thuriya*. In Jagra it is in conjunction with the organs; in Swapna with four; in Sushupti one; and in Thuriya all these organs, and the resulting enjoyments vanish.

12. To identify all the bodily organs as the self is Bhanda; when this false knowledge is destroyed, mukti is attained. The seed of Bhanda is in avidya; and by its acts, maya and its products attach to the Brahman. When avidya is destroyed, maya also vanishes, when this happens, wisdom (gnana) is secured, and Bûtha knowledge disappears.

13. By practice of Karmic rites andakaranas get purified. This purification will induce Gnana (wisdom). This Gnana will induce the knowledge of 'Aham Brahmasmi' 'I am God.' When this 'Ahambrahma' knowledge attains perfection, the self can be perceived in maya as the Moon's reflection is seen in still water.

14. Brahmagnana is knowledge that the Ego is Brahman. And when the self becomes self, and enjoys the self in the self, and when such things as body, senses, prana, lose their form and name, when the great elements are destroyed and the self remains unchangeable, this knowledge is possible

15. When we understand the Mahavakyas such as 'Tatva masi' &c. enshrined in the Vedas, they teach us no more truth than that thou art God. Those who do not attain this knowledge perform worship on the five *Asanas* (postures) and eight kinds of yoga, for the purpose of attaining this *soham* knowledge.

11. The five external senses, eye, ear &c., and the five sensations sabda &c., and the four andakaranas are the fourteen organs active in Jagra; the four active in Swapna are the four andakaranas; and the one, in Sushupti is chitta.

13. Who attains Gnana, Brahman or something else? Is this attainment real or false? Why should this be possible by the purification of bodily senses? Cannot the Brahman see his form except in Maya and before he attains Mukti?

15. The five asanas are Kurmasana, Anantasana, Sihmasana, Padmasana, and Yogasana. Eight minds of Yoga are Iyama, Nyama, Asana, Prànàyàma Pratyàkàra, Dharana, Dhyana and Samadhi.

Mayavadi's Refutation.

1. The confusing statement of the Mayavadi that he is god and that jìvas should attain Mukti by attaining *Ahambrahma gnanam* does not explain the true meaning of Soham Bavana and *Mokshananda*. His statement is like that of one who says that the barren crow picked a piece of rock flesh, and with it fed its young ones, to satisfy their hunger and thirst.

2. If it is true that the Veda states that there is only One, (without a second Padartha), then as the same Veda states that there are *gnathuru, gnana* and *gneya* the statement that there is only one becomes refuted. Besides the statements being contradictory, the value of the Vedic authority will suffer (or that statement of Ahambrahmagnanam is inconsistent with the Vedic doctrine of 'Tatvamasi'). As you do not postulate an intelligence as the soul, separate from God, *Anubhuti* (enjoyment) in Bliss is rendered impossible.

3. Your postulate of the only one Existence cannot be true, as, following the analogy of one Sun shining in many pots of water, the one (God) is formless (unextended) and it cannot unite with a body with form (extended) and cannot produce reflexion (extended form); and no reflexion is also possible, as there is no second thing in which the reflexion can be

2. Gnathuru or the knower is the soul. Gnana is the chit sakti of God whereby the soul knows. Gneya, the known is God. *Anubhuti* implies both perception, knowledge and enjoyment. Unless difference lies at the root, such perception or knowledge is not possible.

3. Other objections are taken as follow. How can the limitless and formless and eternal Being originate in a finite and changeable and extended body? The sun is limited and extended, its reflection is further limited and extended, and the pot of water is also limited and extended. What is reflected is not the sun but one only of its countless rays. There is as such division of the one God involved. And no one mistakes the reflexion itself for the sun.

The real fallacy in the use of the analogy consist in ignoring that in the *Upameya*, thing compared, elements corresponding to a refiecting or refracting medium is positively ignored. And there is also the fallacy of mistaking the reflexion of God for the jiva instead of for God Himself: If we take the sun as God, the reflexion as God's presence in man (soul) and the water, in which the presence is felt as the jiva, and the binding element, pot, as maya and karma then the whole analogy comes off quite correct. For a full discussion and elaboration of this analogy, see my edition of Sivagnanabotham pages 110 and 111. The analogy may also be viewed in another light. The reflexion or image perceived in the water is only a delusive appearance. The real image is formed only in the retina of the eye, and without such perceiver, no reflexion is again possible. Though the sun or moon might shine on a whole sheet of water, no image will be formed unless the eye becomes focussed at a certain point where the light falls We have frequently watched how this image follows one's eye, as one sits watching in a moving train, the moon shining on the tank or sheets of water lying by the road side. So also without a knower, soul, God will only be a nonentity or as good as nonentity. In Bhanda, God is as much Asat to the soul, as the world is Asat in moksha.

formed; and as it also follows that some one else is required to see the reflexion of the Sun (God) formed in the water (body.)

4. The being dwelling in the body does not understand except in conjunction with the different senses enternal and internal; shastras also support such view; and yet you assert like the man who asserts the existence of hare's horns, that the One Brahman in union with the body knows by itself. And then the *Brahma-Gnana* said to be attained by your One Being cannot be of much real import. Difference does exist between the Supreme spirit and the human spirit.

5. If you compare the oneness to the unity of the ruby and its brilliance, you only destroy the oneness. Besides, the ruby and its light are related as guni and guna. If you deny even the attribute of *Ichaha*, *Gnana* and *Kriya* to the One, then the One cannot create this world and It cannot be intelligent.

6. You state that the world is produced from sat as when the straw sticking out of an ant-hill is fancied with great fear to be snake. If so, the person, becoming so deluded must also be the *Vikara* or modification of your Brahman. Such doctrine will only induce deluded knowledge and you will never attain Divine Bliss.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.,

(*Te be continued*).

4. In this verse, a fact is appealed to as proof, besides authority. The fact is that human intelligence is found to be possible in manifestation only when in conjunction with the bodily organs. Between the human mind and the body there is an exact correspondence, correlation and connection and the one rises or falls with the development or decay of the bodily organs. If this being is a *vibhu*, the bodily powers tend to limit this intelligence and it becomes an *anu* (அணு). This fact is either real or not. If real, it requires an explanation. Which is the being which is so limited by the body or which grows or decays with the growth or decay of the body itself? Which is it therefore which is in Bhanda? We point to a being which is in Bhanda; and which is this Being? It cannot be God or Brahman, as the very idea of God is opposed to all sense of limitation, growth and decay. What else is it that is in Bhanda? The Siddhanta view that it cannot be God and that it is the soul different from God that is actually in Bhanda becomes irresistible. If the soul is not postulated, the *Bhanda* will and must surely be ascribed to Brahman. If the idea of Bhanda is itself declared unreal, then the idea of seeking liberation from it, the usefulness of Tapas, Sadana, Sadushtaya and Yoga and Gnana the idea of moksha are also delusions and we will be landed in a practical absurdity, and moral suicide. We need not quote more than verses 36 to 38 in Gita chap. 3, to strengthen the position that man is really dragged into the mire and made to commit, as it were by will constrained (*Sankara* explains as a servant by the king) and Avidya and Maya becomes the King as the Jiva becomes the servant. (See the whole note in pp. 24 to 32 in my edition of Light of Grace). What can it else be but blasphemy to call 'this' that s smoke-enveloped and rust-covered and sin-subjugated, as the one Supreme Light which is '*Svampara Prakasa*,' '*Svadavhne*,' *and* '*Sva Yasase*', '*Siva, Svahan*' and '*Sva Yasya*'?

The brilliance in the ruby is only a separable accident. In darkness it has no brilliance. The brilliance is really derived from external light. As God is nirguna, His relation to the soul or world as *guni* and *guna* cannot be postulated. The Mayavadis would deny to God, Will, Intelligence and Power, his authorship of the world and would interpose a lower brahman, who possesses these attributes; and South Indians who belong to this school regard this lower brahman as asat or no *Brahman* at all, whereas those in the north of Swami Vivekananda school (the editor of the *Light of the East* asks why should we distinguish between Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra because all these are only asat) fully identify the two, saying the distinction is without difference. Some in the South again would deny that this one is Satchidananda, while those in the north admit it to be such. Under any system of theistic philosophy Indian or foreign, the only proof we have of God is because we require an intelligent and an all powerful Being who is the author of the origination, sustentation and resolution of this world and if God is therefore no creator and protector of this world and possesses neither gnana and kriya, the position of the Lokayitha is only thereby strengthened and we cannot prove the existence of such a god. We have elsewhere stated our reasons why the brahman referred to in the second of the Brahma Sutras, cannot be regarded as the lower one in addition to the reasons pointed out by Dr. Thibaut.

6. The fallacy in this simile is in omitting the seer in the Prameya to whom God appears falsely as the world. There being merely God it is unintellible how any *betha* knowledge will arise at first unless the one himself became a *Vikari* modified by delusion. When He clothes himself in delusion the world would result, when he did not choose, the world will not result. As such, maya becomes a real Bhanda of Brahman? Fancy how it looks that this Brahman should forget himself and mistake himself for what he is not. In our human experience and in the illustration of rope and snake, it always happens that when such illusions are caused, the very thing involves the existence of *two real* things and of these two one is mistaken for the other. Both snake and rope are real things. Both of them we know independently. We mistake the rope for the snake. Why? Because our eyesight is dimmed by darkness or weakened by some nervous condition of the system. With perfect vision and in light, *we* will never make the mistake. The real cause of the mistake is thus traced to an *imperfect* intelligent mind and does not exist in the rope or snake itself. So the question resolves itself into this. Why is the human mind imperfect? If it was ever perfect, why did it become so? This question is fully discussed in the article 'Another Side' printed in No. 3 of Vol. I of this journal and need not therefore be discussed by me at length here.

That the simile involves a real difference of *padarthas* combined with a mistaken similarity is well pointed out by Sri la Sri S. Somasundara Nayagar in his numerous works. The two things will not be mistaken for each other if there were no points of similarity between the two. The snake will only be perceived in a rope twisted as a snake is. It will not be perceived in a piece of rock or clay, or shell or silver or any other dissimilar thing. The snake perceived will be of the same dimensions as the original rope. Are all these circumstances present in the *Prameya*. God is Sat, Intelligent and Ananda. The world is asat, unintelligent and sorrow-producing. Is there any point of contact between the two?

TAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 12.*)

முத்தனையமூரலும் பவளவாயின்சொலு
முகத்திலகுபசுமஞ்சளு
மூர்ச்சிக்கவிரகசன் னதமேற்றவிருகும்ப
முலையின்மணிமாலைநால
வைத்தெமைமயக்கியிரு கண்வலையைவீசியே
மாயாவிலாசமோக
வாரிதியிலாழ்த்திடும் பாழானசிற்றிடை
மடந்தையர்கள்சிற்றின்பமோ
புத்தமிர்தபோகம் புசித்துவிழியிமையாத
பொன்னாட்டும்வந்ததென்றாற்
போராட்டமல்லவோ பேரின்பமுத்தியிப்
பூமியிலிருந்துகாண
வெத்தனைவிகாதம்வரு மென்றுசுகர்சென்றநெறி
யிவ்வுலகமறியாததோ
விகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (கூஅ)

98. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions !

Insuperable are *here* * the damnable pleasures of the sex. Their pretty pearl-like teeth, their sweet words passing through their coral lips, their bright shining countenance fresh with saffron yellow, their swelled breasts prominent with strings of gems glittering on and seeming too heavy for their slender waists—all these do excite a violent lust in men and, having wrapped them in the snare of their fierce eyes and lock them up, as it were, in the trance of charm; nay, they plunge them deep in the ocean of this libidinous *maya** Not free from their influence are even the celestial beings, who wink not their eyes and live by the sweet and pleasant drink of *ambrosia*.

Therefore, to seek for emancipation from this world will be simply te employ ourselves in ceaseless struggle. That was reason why, we know, the great sage *Sukha* began to run up to the top of the Nidatha mount at once he was dropped from the womb.

R. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued.*)

* The Saint wants to impress upon his followers or readers the plain fact of *sexual love* in this life being the strongest of evils the man is heir to and the consequent lesson for us that we should try and try again all our life time to estrange ourselves from *it* by declaring and declaring in verse and prose *its* vicious results. Hence even the typical Saints like Apparswami &c., have often sung the injurious consequences of yielding ourselves to sexual appetite in us.

* *Libidinous maya* is according to this school, an entity (matter with its own attributes or qualities illusory in their nature or kind-but the attribute (illusion) is often confounded by the orthodox Vedantins with the entity possessing such attribute. It may be asked here 'what is then meant by a Saiva Siddhanti calling the maya to be false'? The Siddhanti fairly and without any fallacy answers the question thus :—'A Siddhanti calls 'maya' an entity and says it is false because it is literally false *i.e.* false=deceitful (Latin '*falsus*'=deceived), while an orthodox Vedantin calls 'maya' *false* (not an entity) because it is an illusion. I would ask any disinterested inquirer to ponder over here and answer me fair *which* must be correct. (Correctness means logical precision, absence of any fallacy and not open to reasonable questionings nor hostile to reason and experience). If the maya which is false (*deceitful*) is to be understood as a *non-entity* (which no best lexicon seems to support), then why are the systems of Prayer or Guru Darsana or Guru seeking or the doctrine of Divine Arul or the inspiring Mahatmas, or the temple worship or Vedic learning or the Vedas themselves, enjoined as necessary to remove our ignorance, since ignorance due to mayaic *manas* cannot then arise at all ? They are sometimes followed and adopted even by the orthodox Vedantins. If everything is non-entity , except their own 'Self', then their 'Self' can with safety damn these systems as they (Vedantins of this type) will have no things or entities to contecd or struggle against with the weapons of the prescribed modes of *Sâdhana chathushtaya*, *Sariya* &c. They preach against these systems and yet themselves adopt them.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, JULY 1898.

GOD AND THE WORLD.

THE ADVAITA

"The Vedic Texts '*Ekam evadwithiyam Brahma*,' '*Ekam Eva Rudro Nadwitiyya thas teh*' mean that there is only One Supreme Being without a second. And this One is the *Pathi* and not the soul. You, who say ignorantly you are One with the Lord, are the soul and are bound up with *Pasa*. As we say without the (primary sound) 'A' all other letters will not sound, so the Vedas say, without the Lord no other things will exist." Sivagnanabotham (ii. 1. *b*).

"ஆணவத்தோடத்து விதமான படி மெய்ஞ்ஞானத்
தாணுவினோ டத்துவித மாகுநாளெந் நாளோ"

"O for the day when I will be in advaita union with the unchangeable One as I am now in union with *Anava* (*Pasa*)"!

Says Count Tolstoi, "Religion is a certain relation established by man between his separate personality, and the endless universe, or its source; morality is the perpetual guiding of life which flows from this relation." And as we have explained in our previous article, even knowledge of a thing means knowledge of its difference and similarity with other things, its relation to things which are dissimilar, and to things which are similar and from the knowledge of such relation, our further acts are determined. Say, if the object be a new fruit we had not seen before, if we find it related to the edible species, we try to eat it; if not, we throw it away. If one should make however a mistake in the identification, from imperfect experience or knowledge, or misled by the nice and tempting appearance of the fruit, woe befalls him when he partakes thereof. All our good and evil flows accordingly from our understanding right or wrongly our relation to men and things and society. And the highest philosophy and religion accordingly mean also knowledge and knowledge of the relation of the highest postulates of existence; and different systems arise as different kinds of relationships are postulated; and in determining the respective views, imperfect observation and experience, passion, and prejudice, trammels created by heredity and society, have all their play; and we have different moral standards followed by men, consciously or unconsiously, as resulting from their already formed convictions.

Proceeding on our own lines of discovering these relationships, we took with us Dr. Bain to help us on to a particular stage. He is a most uncompromising agnostic and materialist (qualified) and yet we were in perfect agreement with him all the way he took us, and if he refuses to go with us further, and sees pitfalls and dangers in such a path and is not willing to brave such, we can quite understand his motives and can only admire his honesty. So far as we went with him also, it was perfect sailing. We were well aware of things we were talking about, there was no mistaking them, the facts were all within our experience, and there was nothing in them which contradicted our experience and we were not asked to believe things on credit, by appealing to intuition or authority. When reason failed, we were not referred to *Sruti*, and when *Sruti* failed, we were not referred to their own individual yogic experience, and when all these failed, no verbal jugglery was adopted; and nothing was made to look grand by making it a matter of mystery. Our meaning is quite unmistakeable, and we use plain language and if it is not plainer, we shall try to make it so.

We found accordingly that our present experiences and facts of cognition resolve themselves into two sets of facts, two grand divisions, totally distinct, and yet in inseparable relation, and we called them respectively mind, and matter, ego and non-ego, subject and object, atma and pasa, chit and achit, sat and asat. We noted their inter-dependence and inter-relation; as regards the nature of the relation itself, it was in a sense inexplicable. We could say positively that the relation is not one of causation or succession, not mere order in place and it could not be that of the whole to its part, nor one acting on the other, or using the other as its instrument, nor that of container and contained, nor no relation at all; and we could not thus picture this relation in any one of the modes known to us in our actual experience; and the only analogy available to us in nature, namely that of vowels and consonants helped us a good deal to have some idea of this relation. It is not one, it is not two, and our Acharya asks us to keep us quiet, "ஏகமிரண்டென்னுமற் சும்மாஇரு" but still even this posi-

tion requires a naming, and for want of a better name too, we use the word 'Advaita' to such relation. The word Advaitam implies the existence of two things and does not negative the reality or the existence of one of the two. It simply postulates a relation between this two. The relation is one in which an identity is perceived, and a difference in instance is also felt. It is this relation which could not easily be postulated in words, but which perhaps may be conceived and which is seen as two (Dvaitam) and at the same time as not two (Na Dvaitham); it is this relation which is called Advaitam (a unity or identity in duality) and the philosophy which postulates such relation is called the Advaita Philosophy; and it being the highest truth also, it is called the *Siddhanta* (The true end). This view has therefore to be distinguished from the monism of the materialist and idealist, and from the dualism of Dr. Reid and Hamilton. But Dr. Bain and others of his school would regard themselves as monists, but in that case, the distinction between this monism, may we call it qualified monism, and the monism of writers before the advent of the present agnostic school must be carefully observed. There is no wrong in using any name for anything, but when particular associations have been already established, it serves no purpose except to confound and confuse to use old words with new meanings introduced into them. In a sense, this view is also the true monistic view. Say from the individual standpoint, when the man is in a pure objective condition, his mind becomes merged in the body; the mind identifies itself thoroughly with the body and is not conscious of its own distinction from the body. By this process of merger and complete identification, the apparent existence is only one, that of the object; when the mind is free from all object consciousness, the object world vanishes as it were, and there is only one fact present and that is the mind, and nothing else. Without mind however nothing else can subsist, and when the mind is in its own place, nothing else is *seen* to subsist. And how appropriate does the interpretation of that oft-quoted and oft-abused Vedic text, '*Ekam evadvitiyam Brahma*' by Saint Meikandan seem now! When we arrive at the postulate of God, we arrive at the third padartha, and no body has yet been found to postulate an existence higher than these three. And these constitute the thri-padartha of most of the Hindu schools. They differ no doubt in the definition and description of these three entities as also in the pescription of their relationships. This third postulate could not be arrived at by direct perception, observation and experiment. We think however it can be proved by strict logical methods, by such proof as is possible, and we are at liberty to postulate it to explain the residuary facts unexplained by the Materialists and Idealists. If this postulate will explain facts left unexplained by these people and if it will not contradict any of the facts of human nature and probabilities, there is no harm in having It for a workable hypothesis. We believe also that the Materialists and Idealists leave many facts unexplained and that this third postulate is necessary to explain these facts. We, however, do not propose to go into this wide question now. We only propose to discuss God's relation to mind (soul) and matter just at present. And the relation we postulate is the same as between mind and body which we have already postulated and we call it by the same name '*advaita*' And the couplet we have quoted from Thayumanavar conveys the idea most beautifully, and the merit of expounding this beautiful view of '*advaita*' must in the first place be accorded to *Saint Meikandan*, whom *Saint Thayumanavar* himself extols as the பொய்கண்டார் காணாப்புனித மாமதத்துவித மெய்கண்டான்," The Seer of *Advaita* 'Truth'. God is related to the soul as the soul is related to the world. God is the Pure subject, the Pure Ego and the Soul is the pure object, non-ego God is Sat (the true existence), Soul is Asat. As however we have called the world Asat, we are not willing to extend the term to soul also; and it, besides occupies a peculiar position between God, Sat, on the one hand and the world, Asat, on the other hand; and hence the term *Satasat* has been applied to it. The term means that which is neither God nor the world (maya) but which when joined to either becomes completely identified with each. When united to the body, it is completely identified with the body, and when united to God, it is completely identified with God. We have already observed that when the soul is united to the body it is completely identified with it, it has not ceased to exist, as the body ceased when the soul was in its own plane The very existence of the body implied the existence of the soul, though for the nonce the soul was not conscious of its separateness and individuality and distinction from the object or body. Just in the same way when the Jiva is in the Highest union with Sivam, the Jiva is not conscious of its separateness, and individuality and distinction from God. If this consciousness was present there will be no union; and if the soul was not itself present,

to speak of union in Moksha and Anubhava and Ananda will also be using language without meaning. And this characteristic of the soul is very peculiar. It is named சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாதல் or அது அது வாதல், 'becoming one with that to which it is attached.' The Hindu Idealists try to arrive at the postulate of the soul precisely by the same mode of proof as is furnished in sutras 3 and 4 of Sivagnanabotham, and arriving at this postulate which is found to be above the 24 tatwas, above the elements, above the tanmatras, above the Gnana and Karmendriyas, above the four andakarana, they have not paused to discover its further nature and characteristics, and have straightway proceeded to identify it with God whom they have read of in the Srutis, and have not tried to learn the relation between these two; and all the absurdities of the Mayavada school are clearly traceable to not understanding the nature of the soul aright. These further aspects of the soul and its relation to God are therefore well brought out in sutras 7, 6 and 5. And how this Jiva can possibly become Sivam and in what sense, is beautifully brought out in 6. 2. (*e*).

அதுவென்னு மொன்றன்றி அதுவன்றி வேறே
யதுவென்றறி யறிவுமுண்டோ—அதுவென
அறியவிரண்டலலனுங் கறிவுணிற்றல்
அறியுமறிவே சிவமுமாம்.

God is not one who can be pointed out as "That." If so, not only will He be an object of knowledge, it will imply a *Gnatha* who understands Him as such. He is not different from the soul as an object of knowledge. He becomes one with the soul pervading its understanding altogether. The soul so feeling itself is also Sivam.

Chapter II of Light of Grace has also to be read in this connection; and Saint Umapathi Sivacharya asks a question to bring out the importance of this great characteristic of the soul. "Are there not objects in this world which become dark in darkness and light in light?" he asks, and the answer given by himself elsewhere is "the eye, the mirror and akas are such objects." The eye loses its power of seeing in darkness, and recovers it in light; and the others become dark or bright as darkness or light surrounds it. Saint Thayumanavar also refers to this peculiarity in several places and calls the soul யாதொன்று பற்றின தனிபியல்பாய் நின்று பந்தமறும் பளிங்கனைய சித்து நீ. 'You who are like the mirror or crystal removed of dust, becoming of the self same nature of one to which it is joined.' Here the Light is God, darkness is Maya and the Mirror or Eye or Akas is the soul. We all feel that there is a sentience which suffers this change from light to darkness. If this sentience is identified with God himself, surely the change must descend on his head. We have not yet been able to understand (of course we are ready to confess we do not belong to the superior class of mortals said to possess 'the sharpest intellects, a bold understanding' to which ranks our brother of the *Brahmavadin* elevates himself—*vide* p. 749 current volume) how when they postulate only one padartha, One self, and no Jiva, how God can be saved from all the impurity and sin and ignorance present in nature. To say that the Sruti says that God cannot be tainted by such contact is only begging the question and is no answer. To assert that the Infinite God by this false imposition, Avidya had become divided into millions and millions of finite beings and without stopping to make good this statement itself by proof except by giving an analogy (which analogy is found to fail most miserably in most important details) and to assert with the same breath, that this sub-division is false is a mere myth, a dream, that there is no universe, men or Gods, you or I and then to say further that you and I, gods and men and the world are all God seems to be the height of absurdity and not born of 'the sharpest intellect, a bold understanding.' If so, we must have altogether a different definitions of these terms. We will close this paper by quoting two verses from Saint Thirumular and we challenge comparison with them with anything else found in any writing ancient or modern to express the truth of the double aspect and relation we have been describing above with the same aptness and richness of illustration.

மரத்தை மறைத்தது மாமதயானை,
மரத்தின் மறைந்தது மாமதயானை,
பரத்தை மறைத்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்,
பரத்தின் மறைந்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்.

The tree was concealed in the mad elephant;
The tree concealed the mad elephant.
The Supreme was concealed in the world;
The Supreme concealed the world.

(Here tree means a wooden toy elephant).

பொன்னை மறைத்தது பொன்னணிபூஷணம்,
பொன்னின் மறைந்தது பொன்னணிபூஷணம்,
தன்னை மறைத்தது தன்கரணங்களாம்,
தன்னின் மறைந்தது தன்கரணங்களாம்.

The gold was concealed in the golden ornament;
The gold concealed the golden ornament.
The 'I' was concealed in its own senses;
The 'I' concealed its own senses.

These two verses though they look similar are not the same and we will expound their meaning in our **next.**

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

The Divine Perfections.

(*Continued from page 19.*)

Now, as it was above shown, all the beings of which we have experience are contingent, namely, are effects of other causes, and in so far they are posterior to them. But who will venture to say that something is prior to God? Who will be so bold as to assert that something is prior to the first cause? Who will be able to maintain that some one stands to God in the relation of Maker or Architect of his existence?

The primary idea that all men entertain about God is that He is the first Being, the first cause of all other beings the first source, the only fountain of created existence. If therefore, God is the first Cause of every thing, the first source of every existence, He is also the only self-existent, the only necessary Being; that is, so He exists that He cannot but exist, as he possesses in Himself the necessity of his existence; in a word, He is self-existent. This truth is in itself so clear, that neither materialists, nor evolutionists nor pantheists are bold enough to give an explanation of the origin of the present world, without supposing an eternal and self-existent something, either "Maker" or 'the Unknown,' or the so-called Absolute, or the pure Ego, or anything else. This goes to show that the originator, or the First Cause of the Universe must exist of itself, and not be indebted for its actual existence to some other thing, that is, it must be self-existent.

Picture then to yourself that abyss of eternity when nothing was as yet created, but God alone existed happy in himself and from Himself. Then there was no sun, no moon, no stars, no vaulted heaven, no earth, no trees, no animals, no men, nothing whatever. Yet God existed. Do not ask when He was created or born. *When* implies time, and God is the Creator of time also. God is neither created nor born. God forever was, is and shall be: self-existence is His nature, his property, his characteristic. As the characteristic of light is to shine, the characteristic of heat to warm, that of food to nourish, so God's characteristic is to be, self-existence is His nature, his essence, his character, the root of all his other attributes and perfections.

God the First Cause of everything.

God being the necessary, the self-existent Being, it follows that He is the First cause of everything that comes anyway to existence. Creatures do really exist: but their existence is limited, finite and caused. They exist, but they are not self-existent. They only partake of existence. They all rank, though in different degrees in the scale of created existence. Senseless matter exists, but its existence ranks lowest in the scale of creation. Next comes vegetable matter, still higher stands the animal kingdom, but the summit of this visible world is the domain of man, its king, its lord, its most perfect representative. But the scale does not end there: higher it ascends into the world of the spirits, into the world of disembodied souls, into the world of pure minds, not entangled with matter, rising higher and higher towards that infinite eminence where in the sunshine of self-existence and immortality, almighty God abides for ever and ever. All these creatures material and spiritual are not self-existent but partake, though in different degrees, of created existence. Now to whom should they owe their existence but to God, the first source, the only fountain of existence? It belongs to beauty itself to make everything beautiful, to wisdom itself to render everybody wise, and to the self-existent Being to draw from an ideal state into the state of real existence, everything that anyway really exists. But who, save. God, could confer on any one the gift of existence? Who but God could cross the infinite abyss that divides nothingness from existence? Who but God should be that self-existent first cause to whose power the origin of all things is rightly ascribed? We readily grant a certain power of production has been communicated by God to all secondary active causes: but that power must be derived from the same source, whence the contingent being itself is derived, namely, from the self-existent first cause.

In France some years ago, a young man, a native of one of the provinces, was sent to Paris to complete his studies. Like many others he had the misfortune to meet with bad companions. His own passions together with the impious language of his comrades soon led him to a forgetfulness of the pious lessons of his mother, and to a contempt of Religion. He came to the point of wishing, and at length of saying, like the senseless creatures of whom the prophet speaks, there is no God, God is only a word. Incredulity always begins by saying these things as it were in a passing way; it is a plant that takes root only in corruption. After many years' residence in the capital, the young man returned to the bosom of his family.

He was invited one day to a very respectable house. There was a large company assembled. Whilst every one talked about news, pleasure, or business, two little girls, each twelve or thirteen years of age, were reading together, seated in the recess of a window

G. Bartoli, s.j., d. d.

(*To be continued.*)

CAMEOS FROM TAMIL LITERATURE.

HEREWITH we present a few more pictures, which in their naturalness, and exquisite beauty challenge comparison. How often do men forget, engrossed as they are in their various worldly pursuits, that they leave behind them, in their homes, one heart whose sole occupation is in fondly doting and in anxiously brooding over the return of her absent lord?

1. வேனி லுழந்த வறிதுயங் கோய்களிறு
வானிங்கு வைப்பின் வழங்காத்தேர் நீர்க்கவாங்,
கானங் கடத்தி ரெனக்கேட்பின் யானொன்று
சாவுகோ வைய சிறிது.

நீயே, செய்வினை மருங்கிற் செலவயர்ந்தியாழநின்
கைபுனை வல்வின் ஞாணுளர் தீயே,
இவட்கே, செய்வது மண்டில மையாப் பதுபோன்
மெய்யில் வாண்முகம் பசப்பூரும்மே.

நீயே, வினைமாண் காழகம் வீங்கக் கட்டிப்
புனைமான் மரிஇய வம்பு தெரிதியே
இவட்கே, சுனைமா ணீலங் காரெதிர் பவைபோல்
இனைநோக் குண்கண் ணீர்நில் லாவே.

நீயே, புலம்பி னுள்ளமொடு பொருவயிற் செலிஇய்
வலம்படு திகிரி வாய்நீ வுதியே,
இவட்கே, அலங்கிதழ்க் கோடல் வீயுகு மவைபோல்
இலங்கேரெல்வளை யிறையூ ரும்மே.

எனநின்,

சென்னவை யரவத்து மினையவ ணீப்பின்
தன்னலங் கடைகொளப் படுதலின் மற்றிவள்
இன்னுயிர் படுதலும் மாற்றுமோ
முன்னிய தேசத்து முயன்றுசெய் பொருளே.

The Maid.—"Scorched by the summer sun, reduced in body and panting for water, the wild elephants run after the mirage in the rainless desert. This desert, I hear you speak of crossing; my dear sir, will you let me ask of you this, a little.

"You, bent on the preparation for your journey are straightening the bowstring with your hand; whereas,

She, like the moon crossed by the clouds over the clear full moon, has her unspotted face crossed by the shade of sorrow.

"You, strapping tight your strong belt, are choosing the best arrows fit for your purpose; whereas

She, like the bright blue lily filling from the shower of rain, has her eyes overflowing with tears.

You, without any tender thought, and solely bent on acquiring wealth, are brightening your victorious disc free from dust; whereas,

She, like the large stamens and petals falling from the white Gloriosa tree, has her bangles loosened from her wrists.

"Therefore, when her condition is such, at hearing the noise of preparation, where will life be, when you desert her? And then, can all the wealth brought from foreign lands, bring back her sweet life?

2. The following piece continues the same subject introducing some fine similes, and some moral sayings on the duties of kings, and the change of fortune.

The Maid.—"Scorched by the Sun's angry rays, as by the cruel misrule of the king, advised by his minister, who could neither uphold justice nor possess grace, the elephants which formerly shed its juice, over which the flies swarmed, now shorn of their beauty and their strength, fall down flat on the desert sand planting their tusks right into the ground, like the plough driven into dry soil.

Such a desert covered with smoking hill sides you resolved on crossing though even without intimation to us.

I have a word to say to you, my dear Sir, will you hear me.

"The seven strings of the lute which gave pleasure to its hearers suddenly snap and the lute becomes useless.

Wealth, less stable than this lute, can any one ever desire?

"The Goddess of fortune abandons its quandom favourites in more pitiable plight than before.

Wealth less stable than this Goddess can any one ever desire?

"The minister, forgetful of his own interests, and ever intent on securing the glory of his master, suffered ignominy and death at the hands of the angry and ungrateful king.

Wealth, less stable than this king's rule, can the wise ever desire?

"O my Lord, don't desire such wealth, abandon your journey, I pray you. No harm will result. Honor your guests and enjoy the sweets of home. Wealth consists in no other course.

நடுவிகந் தொரீஇ நயனில்லான் வினைவாங்க
கொடிதோர்த்த மன்னவன் கோல்போல ஞாயிறு
கடுகுபு கதிர்மூட்டிக் காய்சினந் தெறுதலின்
உறலூறு கமழ்கடாத் தொல்கிய வெழில்வேழம்
வறனுறு நாஞ்சில்போல் மருப்பூன்றி நிலஞ்சேர
விறன்மலை வெம்பிய போக்கரு வெஞ்சுரம்
சொல்லா திறப்பத் துணிந்தனிர்க் கொருபொருள்
சொல்லுவதுடையேன் கேண்மின்மற் றைஇய,

வீழுநர்க் கிறைச்சியாய் விரல்கவர் பிசைக்குங்கோல்
ஏழுந்தம் பயன்கெட விடைநின்ற நரம்பறூஉம்
யாழினும் நிலையிலாப் பொருளையும் நச்சுபவோ.
மரீஇத்தாங் கொண்டாரைக் கொண்டக்காற் போலாது
பிரியுங்காற் பிறரெள்ளப் பீடின்றி புறமாறும்
திருவினும் நிலையிலாப் பொருளையு நச்சுபவோ ?
புரைதவப் பயனோக்கார் தம்மாக்க முயலுவாரை
வரைவின்றிச் செறும்பொழுதிற் கண்ணோடா துயிர்
வௌவும்,
அரைசினும் நிலையிலாப் பொருளையு நச்சுபவோ ?

எனவாங்கு,

நச்சல் கூடாது பெரும விச்செல
வொழிதல் வேண்டுவல் சூழிற் பழியின்று
மன்னவன் புறந்தர வருவிருந் தோம்பித்
தன்னகர் விழையக் கூடின்
இன்னுறல் வியன்மார்ப வதுமனும் பொருளே.

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page* 22.)

The canons of Tamil epics put special stress on this head. The poetry of the modern school especially is in exact accordance with the mechanism of poetry as expounded in the grammars. But of the art of poetry, the Tamils seem not to have a definite idea, of the true nature and functions of poetry they appear yet to be in the dark. The poetry of the moderns has become a purely mechanical affair. To take hold of a hero, to invoke a special deity, to open the poem with a description of the heroe's country and of the capital where he is supposed to have reigned or flourished, and to narrate the history of the hero in a few chapters and close the work with the heroe's achievement of heaven, are the be—all and end—all of epic poetry. The puranic literature has dwindled down to such a stereotyped formula that the rishis of Naimisaranyam and the great sage Sûda are a matter of absolute necessity even for a half true and half mythical incident only a few centuries old. The author of மாறனலங்காரம் in the 59th and 60th sutrams of his பாயிரம் advises students anxious of acquiring the art to read aloud standard authors, to be an amanuensis to poets, to practice the composition of poetry by completing a poem when the subject and first line or lines are given, and to drill in the acquisition of the mechanism, no matter of the soundness of the thought and other embellishments, and to study carefully the strong old poets. After all this drill, he assures the student, of the excellent poems he will compose. What a practical lesson on the inimitable art!

In analysing the art of modern poetry, the Rev. Father D. J. Beschi states that the Tamil poets use the genuine language of poetry "for (1) they rarely mention any object to which they do not couple some ornamental epithet, (2) they are exceedingly fond of metaphorical expressions, (3) the Tamils make use of allegories (and in their application their extreme passion for hyperbole often leads them into extravagance), (4) they delight in similes (which are not unfrequently strained and such as the better judgment of Europeans would not approve, though they often make them a vehicle for moral instruction—which is esteemed a peculiar excellence) and (5) we find many good instances of the figure hypotyposis or vision, in which the subject is placed before the eyes in minute and faithful description. In the same breath he condemns them :—"The Tamil poets indulge in the boldness of fiction, and employing their deities, pay little regard to the laws of nature. The learned have been at much pains in defending Homer, who has, on one occasion, introduced a horse speaking: but the Tamil poets constantly attribute the power of speech to animals.........In their use of this licence, however, they are so consistent, that a fiction employed in one place, is connected with those which follow; and they insert them so skilfully, that the vulgar look upon the dreams of the poets as real histories; and hence the numerous false notions which are prevalent in this country; and again, the Tamils maintain, that every kind of poem should commence with an invocation.........The precepts which have been laid down on the subject of invocation are numerous and absurd."

The old school of poetry paid more attention to the goodness of the matter than to the form. They rather subjected metre to matter. Metre was a secondary matter to them. There was much of domestic love and the dearness of home. There was more of every day life in them. The moderns have subjected matter to metre. Subject-matter is only a matter of insignificance. What now passes for poetic taste is a childish delight in riotous imagination. Of some of the works of the old school Mr. Sundram Pillay Avargal of Trivandrum College writes on page 661, March number of the *Christian College Magazine* for 1891 :—"They are charming portraits of nature in some of her pleasant and striking moods and for soberness of thought and accuracy of representation they will bear comparison with anything in the whole realm of literature. In them critics will seek in vain for that idle accumulation of hyperbolical conceits which characterizes the Tamil poems of modern times." The late Rev. Bower of Madras who of course had much acquaintance only with modern poets says, "Pathos and sweetness rather than vigour are the characteristics of Indian Poetry. They are not 'thoughts that breathe and words that burn' so much as thoughts that please and words that charm." Of Dravidian Poetry in general Bishop Caldwell writes :—"Whilst an elevated, a natural expressive description, a pithy sententious maxim or a striking comparison may sometimes be met with, unfortunately elegance of style has always been preferred to strength, euphony has been preferred to truthfulness, and poetic fire has been quenched in an ocean of conceits. Nothing can exceed the refined elegance and 'linked sweetness' of many Telugu and Tamil poems; but a lack of power and purpose, and a substitution of sound for sense, more or less characterizes them all." We now see that, though the primary object of all Tamil poets is salvation in due course, the old school cared more for the substance and the modern school care more for the shadow.

Kamban's poetry :—Kamban shared the defects of the modern school, while evincing signs of the excellence of the old school. It is quite true that not one Tamil poet has the fire of Burns and the simplicity and plainness of Chaucer. There was neither a Scott nor a Goldsmith, neither a Shelley nor a Browning among the Tamils. That Kamban was miltonic we cannot doubt. That he had the germs of the genius of Shakespeare we cannot doubt. But he was Milton seen through a microscope, and Shakespeare viewed through a telescope. Of the modern school he was the only poet who understood poetry to mean "the art of employing words in such a manner as to produce an illusion on the imagination, the art of doing by means of words what the painter does by means of colours." But his hero is the All-in-all in human flesh. Kamban believed that Rama was the great God on earth for a special purpose. Ravana was for him a very Rakshas as with ten heads and twenty shoulders. The account of the hero supernatural conquering a monster extraordinary cannot pretend to be true nature. Rama is only man in his dealings with other men, and there Kamban is quite true to nature. But in the field before the Rakshasas he is a prodigy and Kamban piles hyperbole upon hyperbole. But it is to be remembered that he closely follows the original in such affairs and that Valmiki is more responsible than our author, who, however, is bold enough to vary the plot of the original in some places which we shall notice further on in the proper place.

The dark-side of the picture :—An English man remarks that "the Tamil imitation never condescends to be natural, much less prosaic, but is always elaborately rhetorical and ornate. It piles up epithet on epithet, simile on simile till the thought is obscured and the narrative interrupted and almost forgotten." This remark is of course true of the passages which describe the march of armies generally, the வகைக் காட்சி, பூக்கொய்தல், நீர்விளையாட்டு, உண்டாட்டு, &c. of Balakandam, the description of the rainy season in Kishkinda, and a very great part of the seats and scenes of Sunderkanda. Yuthakanda of course is a climax. But Kamban was so much at home with the kings when at home and abroad that he was thoroughly familiar with and accustomed to the confusion and great array of the march of the armies; while ranging in his exile through thick forests and large mountains and vast countries, he saw nature in his naked luxuriant beauty; his imagination was besides so strong and so well developed that he could philosophise and moralise, be it a tree or a river, the whole day without getting tired. The result is that a bit of a story gets entangled among the foliage of his descriptions and musings on nature, and his work cannot be enjoyed but by advanced scholars who can read and understand many hundred stanzas in one breath. Students who cannot in the course of one lesson read at least a

fifty stanzas cannot appreciate him and they cannot be considered competent to meddle with the work; such scholars as can read and understand easily will find no monotony in persuing the Ramayan. Even in a prose version, Kamban can be appreciated only by those who read at least a dozen pages at a time.

Pedants appreciate what are called Kambasutrams. With these weapens they puzzle and befool many scholars otherwise able. The mystery of these Kambasutrams is, that there, syntax is had. Unfold the proper syntax, lay bare the ellipses, and the matter lies in a nutshell. Only the initiated are aware of these sutrams. Their Key is the only *"Sesame"* which can open these caverns: others will only be *oats* and *barleys*. Besides the sutras, there are also certain stanzas pointed out whose meaning, it is said, not one scholar of the day understands. Such sutrams were not consciously composed by Kamban. Such problematic stanzas were not wilfully set in numbers by Kamban. He never intended them to be gordian knots. He went on composing the Ramayan at such a headlong speed at the rate of about 3,000 lines a day that he probably paid very little attention in many places to bad syntax which crept in, unseen. But he explained or untied these knots in his own time, and his explanations have been handed down from generation to generation. There is also no indication that he revised and polished his work.

T. Chelvakesavaraya Mudaliar, M. A.

(*To be continued*).

CORRESPONDENCE.

To

The Editor of the *Siddhanta Deepika*,

Madras.

Dear Sir,

In reference to the article "The Nature of the Divine Personality" which appeared in the *Siddhanta Deepika* for May, I beg leave to make the following observations.

Two points are in dispute in the learned article. First as to the name Saguna and Nirguna, which of the two namely may be said of God. Secondly as to the definition and meaning of the word "Person." To-day I shall attempt to clear up the first question only.

I need not say that the word "Person" may be said of God by analogy only, not by identity, this name "Person" being primarily applied to man and not to God. We say that man is a person, and to this word we connect a corresponding idea, which we likewise and by analogy apply to God. This word person is to be found in every language, and Sanskrit is no exception to the rule. Now, most Sanskrit scholars speak of man as Saguna, or endowed with qualities, and by that they mean to say he is a Person. Are they wrong in so doing? We think not. For, the import of the term Guna is quality or accident; hence Nirguna means want of properties, or also of good properties (cfr. Colebrooke on the Philosophy of the Hindus page 258; Benfey Sanskrit English Dictionary; Monier Williams. Religious thought etc. page 31.)

That Sanskrit scholars are right in rendering the word "Human Person" by Saguna, it may be thus proved. According to the Sankhyan theory, the same thing must be said of the individual soul or Purusha and of Prakriti since the same theory has been applied to the evolution of matter as to the evolution of the soul. Prakriti in itself is a mere blind and dark force, nor, if left alone, does it produce anything. In order that creation be apparent, Prakriti must unite itself with the three Gunas-Satva, Rajas and Tamas. Thus Prakriti, fecundated as it were, by the three qualities, brings forth Buddhi *i. e.*, the intellect or intelligent perception; and next the faculty of self-consciousness or personality, called the I-maker Aham-kara. In like manner, Purusha in itself neither thinks, nor feels, nor is conscious. It is when in composition with the three Gunas that Purusha becomes Jiva or Jivatman the personal soul or spirit. So far goes the Sankhyan theory. Nor is it wrong, if we take it in its main features only. For, a person, in the common opinion of mankind is a being that lives, thinks, feels, and is self-conscious. Now all this stands to the soul, as qualities or gunas stand to matter or prakriti. As matter cannot exist without quantity and yet quantity is not matter, so also the human soul cannot exist without the faculty of thinking or mind, and yet mind is a faculty of the soul, not the soul itself. Therefore in regard to the human personality, Saguna and not Nirguna is the word to be used, as a human soul altogether devoid of qualities cannot exist, may it is in no way conceivable. However I do not wish to be misunderstood. When I render the word person by Saguna I take the word in its original meaning *i. e.*, endowed with properties or qualities," without reference to the three specific Gunas-Satva, Rajas and Tamas. These three specific gunas are the out-come of a philosophical system, which however good it may be, cannot stand fully the test of reason.

But when we speak of Almighty God, the thing turns out to be altogether different. God is infinitely simple namely, not only is one undivided Being, but indivisible. If we consider the immaterial soul of man alone, we have

a being not composed of substantial parts, and therefore rightly called a simple substance. "Nevertheless even the soul is not exempt from all composition. It is liable to accidental composition. For, it is changeable in regard to its thoughts and volitions, so that we can distinguish these and it, as component parts of a whole. More over the self-same faculties of the soul are qualities of the soul not the soul itself, and we call them real or physical composition. Not so with God. In God neither of them exists, because no *substantial* or *accidental* composition is conceivable in the Divine Being. Indeed, how could it be? An accident, Guna for instance or quality, is a perfection or modification added to the nature of a substance. But to the nature of the divine substance no perfection or modification can be added. Any addition made could not be the addition of anything self-existent, because what falls under the conception of self-existence belongs to the Divine Nature itself. Nor again, could it be the addition of any thing not self-extistent; because what is not self-existent cannot be found in the Divine Nature. Hence in God there are no accidents, no qualities, no properties, no Gunas whatsoever. Hence the Divine Mind does not need any determination from without to enable it to know all truth, and God's knowledge is His substance. Hence God's Essence is to Him, by identity, intellect, object of thought, and mental representation; so that God in His infinite simplicity is self-conscious, and His infinite simplicity is self-conscious, and His infinite knowledge is attained by one all-embracing act of intuition and this one act is nothing else but the Divine Essence itself, just as the sun illuminated itself by that very light with which it lightens up the whole world" cfr. B. Boedder S. J., Natural Theology, page 92; 258—Therefore I answer to my learned opponent that God described by him at page 278 "as the supporter and spectator and seer, transcending both Prakriti and Purusha and Gods and Ishwaras" is undoubtedly the true God, and as such can be called Nirguna Being according to the meaning stated above. I cannot however agree with him in the description of God as Nirguna, Being such as is found in the Gita, chapter IV. verses 5 to 18. For in this chapter the Author of Gita follows the Vedanta theory according to which God is essentially devoid of qualities, inert, unconscious, neither existent nor non-existent. This being, or rather Non-Being is the God of the Vedantists, and as such it is neither Saguna nor Nirguna. It is not Saguna, because, as it was said, such a Being, is essentially devoid of qualities; it is not Nirguna, because this supreme soul or spirit of the Universe (Atman, afterwards called Brahman) does not enjoy a separate and independent existence, and it exists only in so far as it begins to exist in any object, to think about anything, or to be joyful about anything, and it does so by associating itself with the power of Maya and investing itself with three corporeal envelopes. Therefore arguing against the Vedantists I should say that God is Saguna *i. e.* a Being endowed with qualities, which however are not really distinct from His Divine Essence, and therefore God may be righty called in the sense of my learned opponent Nirguna Being.

MANGALORE, *July 3rd*, 1898. G. BARTOLI. S. J.

REVIEW.

THE LAY OF THE JEWELLED ANKLET.*

A curious Tamil poem called Silappathigaram: 'the chapter of the *Silambu*' (an anklet worn by dancers) —hollow and filled sometimes with pebbles, sometimes with choice gems, which give forth a tinkling sound, has long been known to a few Tamil scholars. It is in three books and eighty cantos.

This is an elegant, but comparatively little known composition, one of the five ancient Tamil poems, being a romantic story like 'The Lady of the Lake,' and not rising to the dignity of an epic. It is often obscure, sometimes very tedious; but it is full of genius.

The following is a specimen of its style. It is the dedication of the first canto to the Sora king:—

1. Praise we the MOON! Praise we the MOON!
It affords grace to the fair and spacious world, like the cool
White umbrella over the flagrant-flower-garlanded head (of the king).

2. Praise we the SUN! Praise we the SUN!
Like the chariot of the lord of Kaviri's† domain,
It wheels around Meru's golden heights.

3. Praise we the vast CLOUD! Praise we the vast CLOUD!
Like his grace it pours down blessings on the world
Begirt by the fearsome sea.

4. Praise we flowery PUGAR! Praise we flowery PUGAR!‡
It uplifts itself, and spreads, and grows together with his (*the king's*) clan,
Above all the world surrounded by the swelling ocean's tide.'

Of this work a very complete edition has recently been published by that admirable Tamil scholar, V. Swaminathaiyar, Tamil Pandit of the Kumbakonam College. (Madras 1892).

The author was a prince of the Sera royal family, hence often called Seraman, who became an ascetic, and is commonly known as *Ilanko-Adigal* (the young prince-ascetic). The religion of the poem is a strange

* Edited by V. Swaminathaiyar, Madras, 1892.
† The river Cavery.
‡ The capital at that time: Pumpattanam (See my Nal. Lex.)

confusion of Jainism, Hinduism, and pre-historic Demonism.

There is an exhaustive commentary by Adiyarkku Nallar, of whom nothing more is known.

The poem is divided into three books, which bear the title of Pugar (Kaveri-pattanam) Madura and Karur, being the chief cities of the Sora, Pandiya and Sera kingdoms respectively. In Pugar there lived a merchant whose name was Macattuvan, who had a son called Kovalan, married to a most beautiful and excellent lady whose name was Kannagi. This young couple lived in a splendid palace, and had great stores of wealth, which they employed in acts of piety and beneficence. Unhappily there was a great festival held in Pugar in honour of Indra, which was wont to be celebrated with surpassing pomp by all the citizens. At this festival there appeared a female musician and dancer of surpassing beauty and accomplishments. This stranger diverted the affections of Kovalan, and in her society he squandered away the whole of his property. When he at length broke loose from her, and returned penniless to his patient wife, he found her worn away with sorrow and distress. Filled with compunction he resolved to leave the city, repair to Madura, and try to retrieve his fortunes. Kannagi, whose lovely character is exquisitely drawn, has an anklet (*Silambu*) filled with precious stones of great value, and with this, which she gives him, as his capital, he hopes to regain his lost fortune. She consents to accompany him, and that very night, in the midnight darkness, they set forth unknown to any of their kindred; and, going along the north bank of the Kaveri, proceeded westward till they reached a park-like enclosure, where a number of Jain mendicants were performing penance; amongst these was an old lady whose name was Gaunthi, who, learning that they were on their way to the renowned Madura, resolved to accompany them, that she might hear the wonderful lessons of virtue taught by the Madura sages. They proceeded onward till they reached *Arangam*, near Trichinopoly, where, in a boat, they passed over to the southern bank of the Kàvèri and entered a thicket full of blooming flower plants. Of course, every portion of this history of their pilgrimage is filled with descriptions and digressions,—sometimes very beautiful, and often not a little tedious,—throwing light upon the life of South India in the olden time.

The second book, which is entitled 'Madura,' relates how they passed on towards the south. There a messenger finds them, giving them tidings of the sorrow which their sudden disappearance had given to their kindred. By that messenger Kovalan sends suitable greetings to his father and mother and all his relatives. They then pass on till they come to the river Vaigai, which they cross on a raft, and arrive at the huts of some ascetics outside the walls of Madura. The next morning, arising early, our merchant commits his wife to the care of *Gaunthi*, and after a touching farewell (one of the gems of Tamil verse) proceeds to Madura to begin his commercial enterprise by disposing of the precious anklet.

In the street of Madura he meets a company of goldsmiths, at the head of whom was the King's head jeweller. To him Kovalan shows the jewelled anklet, and asks him to estimate its value. Now this jeweller was an arrant rogue, and had recently made away with a similar anklet belonging to the Queen, and was living under daily apprehension that he might be called to account whenever the precious trinket should be missed. To him, therefore, the sight of Kovalan's treasure suggested a way of escape. He bade the stranger wait awhile until he should show the anklet to the King, who might very probably purchase it; and then, making his way to the palace, exhibited it, saying, 'There is a thief, whom I have detained yonder, and on whom I found this anklet, which is one missing from your Queen's trinkets.' The King enquired, and found that an anklet was really missing; and, blinded by the influence of unpropitious fate, bade his guards go and bring the thief. This king was called Nedun-Seriyan, and renowned for justice; but alas! no one, least of all a despotic Asiatic sovereign, is at all times wise. The guards went, and seeing Kovalan, whom the goldsmith asseverated to be a thief, one of them despatched him with his sword.

Soon the intelligence is brought to where his unhappy wife (the virtuous Kannagi) is awaiting his return, and she rushes forth to the city, making the streets resound with her cries. She finally finds her husband and embraces his dead body, when he opens his eyes—restored for a moment to life—and after tenderly bidding her await reunion, closes them again, and is received into Paradise. She rushes away filled with fury, tears off one of her breasts, and flings it with curses over the guilty city, and then makes her way to the King. 'You have slain my husband,' she said, 'who never did wrong or injustice. What gems were in your Queen's anklet? for in mine are rubies.'

So saying she broke the anklet open and exhibited them to the King. 'Ah!' cried he, 'in my wife's anklet were only pearls. I have slain an innocent man; and am I worthy to be a king? May I this day perish!" So saying, he fell dead at her feet. Kannagi, raging in her despair, cries upon the god of fire, who immediately appears: 'O virtuous matron, who hath wronged thee? The instant thine husband was unjustly slain, I had the command to consume the guilty'—Slay not Brahmans, or the virtuous, or kine, or women, or the aged, or infants; but consume the rest.' So the conflagration raged till guilty Madura was wrapped in flames. Then appeared the guardian goddess of the city and thus addressed the raging widow: 'I am the goddess of this city. No king before this was ever guilty of the least injustice, and in this case I will tell thee the secret of thy suffering. In the town of Singapuram there was a king who slew a merchant named Sangaman, accused by one Barathan of being a spy. His wife was called Nili, and she wandered long on the mountains, praying that he who had caused her grief might in another birth suffer as he had caused her husband to suffer. Kovalan was that Barathan, and was therefore born again as you know him, and has suffered for his crime committed in that former birth. On the fourteenth day from this thou shalt join thine husband.' Thus comforted, Kannagi left Madura, went to the mountain country, and on the hill of Tiru-chenkunrru under a *Vengai* tree waited till, on the fourteenth day, Kovalan appeared in a celestial body, and bore her away to Paradise. Here ends the story as connected with Madura.

The last book connects the history with Vanji or Karur and is evidently composed to account for the worship of Kannagi, as it is now performed in a multitude of temples in the West. Her image is to be seen with the lacerated bosom, and she is adored under the name of the 'Chaste Matron Deity.' The idea that any one cruelly wronged becomes after death a powerful demon, inflicting sore calamities unless propitiated, is at the very foundation of the superstitious of the South and West, as indeed of all India. The people who dwelt around the hill upon which Kannagi went up in the chariot, forthwith instituted a solemn dance in honour of the new Divinity, and hastened to inform their king, who came to the spot and erected an altar and ordained sacrifical rites. He then proceeded to the north, and after a variety of wild undertakings brought back a huge stone from the Himalayas, out of which the statue of the Demoness was cut. This worship is still paid. It is said that the son of the king who so cruelly murdered Kovalan offered in sacrifice 1,000 goldsmiths to propitiate the Demoness, and instituted the Feast still celebrated in her honour. It was only then that the plague of drought was removed and the Pandyan land again became fertile. There are doubtless some grains of historic truth here, and it would be very interesting to have the matter scientifically investigated.

G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Says the *Indian Social Reformer*:—

We have often had occasion to notice favourably the *Siddhanta Deepika* in these columns. We are glad to see that it has completed its first year, and we congratulate the conductors on the able way in which they have been conducting the Magazine and wish them every success in the future. We must, however, take this occasion to warn them of the danger they run in regard to the prime object of their magazine, by admitting translations and commentaries on Sanskrit works in their pages. Their object seems to us to be the elucidation of moot points in Tamil sacred and philosophical literature. The facination of Sanskrit is so strong on even those who might be expected to feel none of it, that the Vedanta Sutras are being regularly translated in the pages of this magazine. We again say we regret the deviation. Not that we hold lightly the treasures of Sanskrit literature, but we do not like the tendency everywhere to tread its well-trodden paths.

We are grateful for our contemporary's remarks and quite appreciate his anxiety that we should not deviate from our devotion to the cause of Tamil. But a reference to the first number of our Magazine where we set forth 'Our Aims' will show that the translation of *rare* Sanskrit works was not without our scope. In fact, in the short memorandum which we originally circulated to our friends, Srikanta's great work was expressly included in it. About Srikanta's work, itself, by an irony of fate which we could not understand, it has been left unnoticed by every European Scholar of note, though Indian Scholars admit that it is the most ancient commentary on the Vedanta Sutras now extant. This is the commentary followed by all the Tamil people, and this fact will serve to explain what was meant by Vedanta, which is approvingly alluded to and distinguished at the same time from Siddhanta, in Tamil works and to explain that leaven of Brahminism in the Tamil race. The translation of this work will, we are sure, throw further historical light on the much debated question, whether Sankara's interpreta-

tion of the Vedanta Sutras is the correct and ancient one or those of other schools. The following quotation from Dr. Paul Duessen will show to what extremes enthusiasts of Sankara's school can go. Say she, "It is true that even here, in the sanctuary of Vedantic metaphysics, the realistic tendencies, natural to man, have penetrated, producing *the misinterpreting variations of Sankara's Advaita* known under the name of Vishistâdvaita, Dvaita, Siddhâdvaita of Ramanuja, Madhava, Vallabha, but India till now has not been seduced by their voices." The *italics* are ours, and if the statement is true, Srikanta must have attempted the impossible. We will examine the learned German Doctor's figures as regards the numerical following of each school later on.

***

We regret very much that the Hon'ble Justice M. G. Ranade's proposition before the Committee of the Bombay University Senate *in re* the recognition of the vernaculars should not have been carried, by the mere casting vote of the chairman.

***

A Reverend Doctor observed at the meeting that the study of vernaculars should be encouraged and voted against the proposition. How does he hope to achieve his object when no body thinks the study of the vernacular of any use to him to pass his examination and earn a living?

***

Another Hon'ble Gentleman preferred the classics to the vernaculars. The question is not one of individual taste nor of comparative merit of two languages and literatures. The real question is as Mr. J. Kapadia put it to make the vernacular a proper and fitting vehicle for conveying and spreading Western knowledge and Western culture among the masses.

***

One of the arguments adduced against the recognition of vernaculars is, that it does not want encouragement, and that there is already a good vernacular literature in it and scholars well versed! This suicidal argument would involve and require the non-recognition of every popular language, European or Indian.

***

To the credit of the Madras University and Government be it said, every one of the chief vernaculars of the Presidency have been recognized from the beginning and we are now engaged in agitating for a further extension. Only the examinations and rules instituted by the late Director of Public Instruction revolutionized the mode of non-collegiate education obtaining in the Presidency before his time to a considerable extent.

***

And the result of this has been, as was well pointed out by our old Professor, a high educational authority, the almost total abolition of the purely indigenous vernacular schools, thereby taking the bread out of the hands of the old class of *Vathiar* pundits, and who had around him the pick of his pupils to impart the knowledge of the higher departments of vernacular literature. With the loss of all hope of securing a Government situation, have vanished also all the chances of pursuing a pure vernacular education.

***

It has panied us to see some of the old class of pundits literally starve, those who had not the good fortune to secure a Munshi's place in an English school, or felt it *infra dig* to accept such a place. These men in the olden days would have had rich pupils and patrons to help them and to appreciate their labours. In a few years, we are quite sure we would have seen the last of the race, which Heaven forbid somehow.

***

Our contemporary of the *Indian Social Reformer* (following the *Madras Mail*) would not admit that the system of education has any thing to do with the decadence of Tamil literature, but would trace it to the peculiar Social conditions prevailing in Southern India, namely that the literary class, the Brahmins, have never owned, though they had adopted, the vernaculars as their mother tongue. He asks also how many Tamil classics are the work of Brahmins. The reason and the question conflict among themselves. If the Brahmins are the sole literate class, and some only of the Tamil works were written by the Brahmins, how does he account for the mass of Tamil literature ancient and modern that is now extant? Of course this results from forgetting that Brahmins have not been the only literary class in Southern India and that most of the old indigenous schools and learning were in the hands of non-Brahmins, who number of course more than 90 per cent of the population. It might be quite true that the Brahmins who never owned the Tamil and who therefore had very few authors among them completely began to neglect the vernaculars, but the question remains why did the Tamilians themselves neglect their own mother tongue? We wish we could get an explanation from our contemporary for this phenomenon? He cant say that they have all begun to study Sanskrit.

***

But we dare say even this cannot but be more than partially true. The traditions of the Tamil language are always most gratefully connected with the Brahmins. That Arch-Brahmin Agastaya was almost the founder of the Tamil literature, and he had a large number of Brahmin pupils, and some of the greatest of Tamil writers such as Tolkappiyan and others. They were most numerous among the poets of the Sangam. Narkirar, Kabilar, Sambanthar, Manikha Vachakar, Sundarar, and Kachiappa, Arul Nandi, Umapathi, Parimelalagar, Nachinarkiniyar were some of the most able vielders of the Tamil language and no more revered names are to be found throughout the Tamil country. The fact however cannot be ignored in the present day that Tamil is not so much studied for its own sake; and Sanskrit has become a greater favourite to than ever.

***

Madras:—Printed by P. C. Kalliana Sundara Nadar, at the C. N. Press, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. Nagarathnam.